



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,656	06/01/2001	Masahiko Hatori	JP920000188US1	2784

47052 7590 09/06/2006

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP  
PO BOX 51418  
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



### **DETAILED ACTION**

This application has been examined. The claims 2-3, 5-8, 11, 14-15, 18 and 26-31 are pending. The examination results are as following.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-3, 5-7, 11, 14-15, 18 and 26-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vouri et al. (US 5,420,605) in view of Matthews III et al. (US 6,344,865).

As to claim 3, Vouri et al. discloses in fig. 1, a computer system having a central processing unit (CPU 12), and a display apparatus coupled to the CPU, the computer system comprising: an input section (see keyboard or pointer device 32, see col. lines 30-35) to present a zoom position (see col. 11, lines 60-64) that specifies a pre-determined magnification amount for zooming in on an image displayed on a display screen (see col. 12, lines 27-33) of the display apparatus (see col. 5, lines 22-31); a resolution changing unit operable to zoom in on the image displayed on the display screen in accordance with the pre-determined magnification amount by changing a resolution of the display apparatus from a first resolution to a second resolution (see col. 7, lines 23-40) in response to the user input selecting the zoom position (see fig. 9, col. 11, lines 47-64); and a display status restoring unit operable to hold a first display status of the image displayed on the display screen before the resolution of the display apparatus is changed to the

Art Unit: 2629

second resolution by the resolution changing unit, the display status restoring unit further operable to restore the image displayed on the display screen to the first display status when the resolution of the display apparatus is restored to the first resolution (see fig. 9, col. 11, lines 47-68 and col. 12, lines 1-17).

However, Vouri et al. does not disclose present a zoom factor to a user, the zoom factor specifying a predetermined magnification amount for zooming in on an image displayed on a display screen of the display apparatus and being a number equal to a first resolution of the display apparatus divided by a second resolution of the display apparatus, the input section further operable to receive user input selecting the zoom factor.

Matthews, III et al. discloses a display system having the zoom factor (resolution factor  $N=800/640=1.25$ ) specifying a predetermined magnification amount for zooming in on an image displayed on a display screen of the display apparatus and being a number equal to a first resolution (800) of the display apparatus divided by a second resolution (640 or  $N=800/640=1.25$ ) of the display apparatus (see col. 11, lines 28-45), and the input section is operable to receive user input selecting the zoom factor (see selectively displayed is in response to the press a menu button (see col. 11, lines 6-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the using zoom factor and being a number equal to a first resolution of the display apparatus divided by a second resolution of the display apparatus as taught by Mathews III, et al. into the display system of Vouri et al. having a display status restoring unit operable to hold a first display status of the image displayed on the display screen before the resolution of the display apparatus is changed to the second resolution by the resolution changing

unit, the display status restoring unit further operable to restore the image displayed on the display screen to the first display status when the resolution of the display apparatus is restored to the first resolution for producing the claimed invention because this would provide the system may then determine the size of the menu to be displayed by multiplying the resolution factor by the specified size of the authored item and allow scaling of the image sizes between varying screen resolution, so that to prevent a user from inadvertently shrinking the size of displayed information beyond a usable size (see col. 11, lines 45-66).

As to claim 2, Vouri et al. discloses further, wherein the computer system further comprises a window resizing unit operable to resize a window displayed on the display screen in accordance with the second resolution in response to user input selecting the zoom factor (see figs. 11a-11c).

As to claim 5-6, and 14, Vouri et al. discloses further, comprising an electrical switch operable, (see fig. 8, see col. 7, lines 55-58) to accept the user input selecting the zoom, wherein the electrical switch is provides as a keyboard that is coupled to the computer system (see col. 4, lines 31-34). However, Vouri et al. does not disclose a zoom factor.

Mathews III et al. discloses a zoom factor as discussed above.

As to claim 7, Vouri et al. discloses further wherein the user input selecting the zoom factor is received through the user clicking on a button within a graphical user interface displayed on the display screen on the display apparatus (see click zoom icon 54, fig. 2).

As to claim 15, Vouri et al. discloses further, wherein the input section is operable to present one zoom position to the user for user selection, each zoom specifying a respective pre-determined magnification amount and being a number dependent upon allowable resolutions of

Art Unit: 2629

the display apparatus (see col. 11, lines 55-64). However, Vouri et al. does not disclose a zoom factor. Mathews, III et al. discloses a zoom factor as discussed above.

As to claims 11 and 18, claims 11 and 18 are similar to claim 3 as discussed above.

As to claims 26, 28, and 30 Vouri et al. discloses further wherein the image is displayed within in active window and the resolution changing unit is operable to zoom in on the image displayed on the display screen by resizing the active window (see changing of resolution of 640x 480 and 800x 600, see col. 5, lines 24-27, and col. 6, lines 6-14).

As to claims 27, 29, 31 Vouri et al. discloses the image is displayed within an active window and the resolution changing unit is operable to zoom in on the image displayed on the display screen by resizing the active window (see changing of resolution of 640x 480 and 800x 600, see col. 5, lines 24-27, and col. 6, lines 6-14). Thus Vouri et al. discloses a size of an inactive window being displayed on the display screen remained unchanged irrespective of the resolution change of the display apparatus from the first resolution to the second resolution because if inactive window therefore, the resolution will not operation.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vouri et al. (US 5,420,605) and Mathews, III et al. (US 6,344,865) in view of Curtis (US 6,580,434).

Vouri et al. and Mathews disclose a computer system comprising an input unit and a display zoom factor as discussed above. However Vouri et al. and Mathews III, et al. do not disclose the input unit is a voice input apparatus.

Curtis discloses a conventional computer (20) in fig. 1, comprising a program modules stored on the hard disk, magnetic disk (29), ROM (24) or RAM (25). The computer (20) may be

Art Unit: 2629

connected to keyboard (40) or other input devices such as microphone (voice input, see column 5, lines 30-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the voice input device such as microphone as taught by Curtis into the display system of Vouri et al. and Mathews, III et al. having Zoom factor for producing the claimed invention because this would convert the sound signal from the outside to the main processing unit, which help the user to easy to hear the information of the system.

#### *Response To Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 3, 5-8, 11, 14, 15, 18 and 26-31 filed on 6/28/06 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2629

*Correspondence*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7698. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI, FROM 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimnhung Nguyen

Patent Examiner

September 4, 2006



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600